

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #270
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 19 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 270

Today's Topics:

 440 in So. Cal.
 Existing regulations limit our advancement.
 FCC licensing delay reason

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 94 10:16:42 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>Guess what Ed, Part 97 DOES NOT!

Dammit, I don't claim that it does! The fact that there is no difference in
legal status between an "open" and a "closed" repeater doesn't mean that there
is no difference in the real world.

The FCC says that any repeater licensee CAN limit the use of his repeater to
certain user stations. It does NOT say that he MUST.

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 17:09:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!

kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <2ttqdc\$c7t@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@spot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>But, there are already radio services to provide such capability. Amateur
>radio is not supposed to be used as an alternative to other radio services.

There are commerical alternatives to virtually every aspect of amateur radio. We may as well then eliminate all conventional analog repeater systems then, right? Regarding HF: You want to talk to someone in Great Britain? Use AT&T.

>> * Amateur paging systems. (Yes I, know paging transmitters require
>> multiple sites and a hell of a lot of power to reach those tiny
>> little receivers that attach to your belt.) And, no, I don't
>> consider DTMF decode on an HT (opened via tones passed through
>> the repeater) a realistic substitute.

>How would building an amateur paging network help advance the state of the
>radio art? Anyway, if you want a pager, there are already existing radio
>services for this.

In the first few paragraphs of the initial post, I referred to integrated digital systems from cellular carriers. I guess when I broke up the amateur equivalent into individual examples, it was not obvious that I was referring to integrated digital amateur systems to accomplish all of the given examples. Sorry about that.

>> * Fully private encrypted conversation using digitally encoded voice.
>> Usefull for talking to your spouse, your banker or boss via the phone
>> patch.
>> (We are so concerned with the anti-business related traffic laws that
>> the only conversations allowed preclude the demand for any non-amateur
>> initiated/related communications. I am not suggesting offering the
>> services to anyone but immediate family. An emergency situation, of
>> course, is different.)

>But, there are already other radio services for calling people on the telephone.
>What good does letting ham radio be used for this do?

Again, why do you not make this same argument for every other aspect of amateur radio. Why are integrated digital service bad but anything analog is good?

>>These are just a few examples. Imagine the potential for enhanced public

>>service (and technical advancement) if we had such systems!

>You can have such systems. Go to your local two-way radio store, pay your
>bucks, and you can have these services. They already exist. GMRS, LMRS,
>SMR, paging, etc.

I agree. As I said in other postes, amateur radio will die fo just
those reasons.

>My point is, amateur radio is not intended just to deploy more radios like
>we already have all over the commercial services. Amateur radio is intended
>to be experimental, and a test bed for new technologies. Allowing too much
>"end user" consumer style use already stifles the technical development
>in amateur radio.

Yes. It should be test bed. What do you suggest we start testing?

My point was, that as local digital networked services via RF begin to
appear, we continue to play with AX.25, analog, interference prone
repeater systems and the like.

--

/`-_-	kevin.jessup@mixcom.com		Vote Libertarian!
{	}		
\	/		
__*	N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio		Call 1-800-682-1776
	N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA		for more information.

Date: 18 Jun 94 10:24:58 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!
news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: FCC licensing delay reason

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CrK0zL.5s0@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

> johnsoj@autsb.allied.com (Jeff Johnson) writes:

>

>>I was talking to the local ARRL VEC coordinator yesterday evening on 2M.

>

>>He informed me that the FCC is rewriting the software which prints

>>technician licenses to indicate whether or not the technician has

>>passed the code test or not.

>

> Oh, no. I hope the FCC isn't actually rewriting it.

[snip]

> They'll probably do it in COBOL.

Then there's a chance it may actually work! :-)

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 15:09:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
mahjmac@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <061594092829Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <9WK0kexTYV8F063yn@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<061894035927Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: license turnaround times..

>>> Yep. A friend just got his after 12 weeks. It should be there pretty
>>> quickly.
>>>

>>
>>Yep, it came today!
>>

>Congradulations!
>WHAT IS THE CALL?
>Dan N8PKV

I passed my tests on February 26'th and my license was in my mailbox
this morning (Saturday). I'm only home weekends, so it came sometime during
the past week.

Michael
KB8STS (Finally!)

Interesting note, my Operator Privileges section says TECH PLUS, which I
am, so it looks like they DID change the license to reflect the additional
privileges.

73 (Is that right?)

--

| Michael A. Hotz J.M. Allen Creations mahjmac@netcom.com |
Of course my opinions represent those of my company, I own it! ;-)

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 94 10:18:15 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tnbi4\$32a@agate.berkeley.edu>, <BWyz4YE.edellers@delphi.com>,
<061894032359Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>Where in part 97 does it grant access to all frequencies or bar anyone
>from a specific frequency (outside the band plan and coded frequencies?

97.101(b).

Date: 18 Jun 1994 17:53:55 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tkvin\$69k@news.iastate.edu>, <CrHppI.4DE@ra.nrl.navy.mil>,
<061894033422Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: CW Argument...

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David Drumheller) writes:

>> Nevertheless, I could agree to slower code requirements. In fact, I
>>could agree to the elimination of the Extra Class license entirely. Just
>>give all the Extra Class privileges to the Advanced Class licensees, and
>>turn all Extra Class licensees into Advanced Class licensees, or visa
>>versa. Justification: Morse code is an antiquated mode. Even the Navy
>>and Coast Guard have stopped teaching it to radiomen.

>There is a HELL of an idea Move the "advanced class ops" to EXTRA rename
>General to Advanced (It really isn't "General" anymore) and combine the
>extra/advanced written (Improve it?). Eliminate the 20 WPM and keep the 13
>or move it to 10.

Hell to it! Why not just give Ham tickets to anyone who goes and asks for
one, scrap the exam, scrap the morse. After all, who needs radio knowlage to
use a "black-Box" radio nowadays?

scarcastic mode off

Why not just do the code, you are only campagning for it to be scrapped 'cos

people cannot be bothered. If you ain't willing to make the effort, then you shouldn't have the ticket. That simple.

Regards, Red.

GW0TJO.

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 22:47:11 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <J67Mnq4.edellers@delphi.com>, <Cr56o4.KKy@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>,
<Cr5AEn.A9t@cup.hp.com>
Subject : Re: Question about Radar Jamming

In article <Cr5AEn.A9t@cup.hp.com> jholly@cup.hp.com (Jim Hollenback) writes:
>

>Of course in California only the local yokels and county mounties get to
>use radar. The bears only get to use it if the county mounties buy it for
>them to use it in their county. Otherwise the bears are very sporting and
>only get you by doing a bumper tag or the eye-in-the sky. Gives a sporting
>chance to the the sharp driver and keeps the radar detector crowd wondering.
>If rear-view mirrors wore out, I'd be on my 10th by now. Sun roofs are real
>nice also.

It's no wonder auto insurance is so costly in SoCal with lunatics like this
on the road. Why be so proud about breaking the law? Stay under the speed
limit and save a life or two.

Jeff NH6IL (an ex-fireman from SoCal who has seen, many dozens of times, the
end result of a speeding motorist fly through a windshield at
70 mph. Quite nauseating to have to pick up the pieces.)

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 00:06:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
mahjmac@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <199406162011.PAA08843@news.cs.utexas.edu>, <CrK0zL.5s0@wang.com>,
<1994Jun18.102458.2498@hnrc.tufts.edu>
Subject : Re: FCC licensing delay reason

[sombody wrote]

>>>I was talking to the local ARRL VEC coordinator yesterday evening on 2M.
>>>
>>>He informed me that the FCC is rewriting the software which prints
>>>technician licenses to indicate whether or not the technician has
>>>passed the code test or not.

Seems to be working quite well! FINALLY received my ticket which I have
been waiting for since February 28, and it says TECH PLUS in the Operator
Privileges box.

Michael

--

```
-----  
| Michael A. Hotz      J.M. Allen Creations      mahjmac@netcom.com |  
|      ----- Technician Plus Amateur Radio Operator KB8STS ----- |  
| Of course my opinions represent those of my company, I own it! ;- ) |  
-----
```

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 94 01:22:27 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tnbi4\$32a@agate.berkeley.edu>, <BWyz4YE.edellers@delphi.com>,
<061894032359Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>Where in part 97 does it grant access to all frequencies or bar anyone
>from a specific frequency (outside the band plan and coded frequencies?

Subpart D tells which bands, subbands and modes are available to each class;
I can't find ANYTHING in Part 97 that allows someone (other than the FCC) to
order me not to use a specific frequency that Part 97 otherwise authorizes me
to use.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #270
